The Akkadian Words for "Grain" and the God Ḫaya

Mark Weeden

Summary

Akkadian had two words meaning "grain, barley" associated with the Sumerogram ŠE: *še'u*(*m*) and *e*(*y*)*yû*(*m*). The former is a borrowing from Sumerian, the latter most probably Semitic. New evidence is presented for both words in lexical lists, with care taken to make explicit the philological contexts in which they occur. The question of the etymology of the Semitic word is approached, with an evaluation of the kinds of evidence available. It is suggested that derivation from **ḥyy* "life" is indeed plausible, although not from the stem-form **ḥayyum*. The divine names Ea and Ḫaya, spouse of Nissaba, are also considered. While Ea and Ḫaya may be at some remove genetically related to each other and to *e*(*y*)*yû* they should not be considered to be identical in historical epochs.[1]

1. The Debate so far

The Akkadian word for "barley, grain" is traditionally assumed to be *še'u*(*m*), but has been argued on the basis of the evidence from lexical lists in fact to be *û*(*m*), with the use of the sign ŠE being used logographically to write the word *û*(*m*).

The elementary sign-list Syllabary A (S^a) was used by scribes as a crucial early stage in learning to write.[2] In its version written on tablets from the first millennium, it has variant readings at line 386:

manuscript A reads
DIŠ še-e = ŠE = *ú-um*;
manuscripts I and U read (compositely)
DIŠ še-e = ŠE = *še*-[*u*].[3]

1 I am very grateful to A.R. George, D. Schwemer and J.D. Hawkins for reading draughts of this article and preventing me from committing umpteen infelicities of structure, logical errors and unnecessary obfuscations. Any such remain my own fault. I am also grateful to L. Kogan for commenting on some of the ideas.

2 On lexical lists in general, see Cavigneaux 1980–1983; Civil 1995. N. Veldhuis is working on a much-needed primer dedicated to cuneiform lexical lists. In Old Babylonian (OB) Nippur they used the sign-list Ea (monolingual) with its pendant vocabulary Aa (bilingual) in the position that S^a occupied in the curriculum. The function of each was to introduce the students to the polyvalence of individual cuneiform signs, although the variety of equivalent Sumerian values given to each sign was more reduced in S^a than it was in Ea.

3 MSL 3.40, 386.

Die Welt des Orients, 39. Jahrgang, S. 77–107, ISSN 0043-2547

Instead of reading *ú-um* in the third column as the Akkadian word corresponding to Sumerian še, the original editor, R.T. Hallock, interpreted this *ú-um* in manuscript A as the sign-name of ŠE.[4] In doing this he referred back to line 243 of the same text, where it appeared to him that the sign UM was also being used as the name of the sign ŠE when referring to its insertion inside the sign KUM to produce the sign GAZ (= KUM x ŠE).[5] Collation has since shown this UM to be a phantom in all attestations.[6]

In 1982, *u-um*, as written in a late version of Aa, was recognised as an Akkadian word for "barley" by M. Civil while commenting on an Early Dynastic lexical text which required the sign ŠE to have the Sumerian value u_{20}. Civil commented that it would be worth following up this *u-um* in other Akkadian contexts, but that this was not his present concern.[7]

In 1989, A. Cavigneaux argued on the basis of further lexical evidence that the Akkadian word for "barley, grain" corresponding to Sumerian ŠE was not *še'u*(*m*) at all, but *ûm*, with the sign ŠE being used logographically (ŠE-*um* etc.) in all other cases.[8] The word *še'um*, if it exists at all, is a loan word from Sumerian, by this explanation. *ûm* on the other hand is the Semitic Akkadian word for "grain", derived from the Semitic root for "life", **ḥyy*.[9] This root is not otherwise attested in Akkadian. The etymology is said to be supported by writings of a similar word corresponding to Sumerian še in fragments of the lexical list Ur_5-ra = *ḫubullu* (traditionally abbreviated "*Hh*") from Emar in Northern Syria:

4 The typical lay-out of a Mesopotamian lexical list from the first millennium BC will be divided into sub-columns: (1) phonetic Sumerian (2) Sumerian sign (3) name of Sign, with possible comment on sign-structure (4) Akkadian translation. Not all sub-columns are always present. On the sign-names see Y. Gong 1995; id. 2000; Livingstone 1997: 4–5. The typical (schematic) structure of a comment on a sign-form is (in an Akkado-Sumerian pidgin): šà sign-name1-ak-*u* sign-name2(-*a*) ì.gub(-bu) "sign-name 2 stands inside sign-name 1".

5 MSL 3.40 fn. 386 (2) referring to l. 243 (sign GAZ) was read by Hallock as having the following explanatory note in sub-column (3): *šá qum-ma-<ku> um i-gub-bu*. Hallock interpreted this as "inside KUM there stands um (i.e. the name of the sign ŠE)". This idea was later reprised by A. Livingstone (1997: 4–5) and used as a further means of proving that the Akkadian word for barley was *ûm*.

6 The existence of UM as the name for the sign ŠE was refuted through collation by M. Geller and I. Finkel on behalf of by M.P. Streck (1998): the manuscripts read: CT 11.10 rev. ii 27 *šá-kum-ma-⌞ku še-a i-gub⌟*; obv. i 9 [DIŠ] ⌜ga-az⌝GAZ[…k]u? še-a; obv. iii 2 [š]á-kum-ma-k[u š]e-a ⌜i?-gub?⌝, i.e. exactly what one would expect: "inside KUM a ŠE stands" (freely translated. The use of phonetic *šá* for Sumerian šà is usual in these commentaries).

7 Civil 1982: 15; Livingstone 1997: 3.

8 See in particular OB Lu (MSL 12.159) lú še tuku = *šá é-a-am i-šu-ú*; OB Lu B ii 13 (MSL 12.178) lú še tuku = *šá a-am i-šu-ú*, in both cases literally "the one who has barley".

9 Etymology accepted by Vanstiphout 1989, who assumes knowledge of an Akkadian metaphor "grain" = "life" for the composers of the Sumerian disputation "Laḫar and Ašnan, Ewe vs. Grain".

še ur$_5$.ra = *e-ia ḫu-bu-ul-li* "grain of debt" Msk. 74191a obv. ii 33–42;[10]
[še ù] máš.bi = *e-ú ù ṣi-bat-š*[*u*] "grain and its interest" Msk. 731067 rev. 7;[11]
[še ù má]š.bi = *e-ú* [...] Msk. 74171f, 5.[12]

Various parts of these proposals have been supported, contested and qualified in several small articles and notes since that time.[13] The *Chicago Assyrian Dictionary* (CAD) accepted that the lexical evidence "suggests the existence of an Akkadian word *u'u* or *e'u*", further adducing Emar Ur$_5$-ra II 103:

ì.dub še = *na-aš-pa-ak e-i*, "the heaping up of grain" Msk. 74191a obv. ii 47.[14]

That *ûm* was the word underlying ŠE was accepted by W.H. van Soldt in his introduction and commentary to *Altbabylonische Briefe*, 13/2.[15] He interpreted half-logographic forms such as ŠE-*a-šu* (accusative with S3 pronominal suffix) and ŠE-*e* (accusative with S1 pronominal suffix) as evidence for Cavigneaux's *ûm* hiding behind the logogram ŠE. ŠE-*e* he derives from **ā*+*ī*, thus presumably expecting a result /*ê*/.

In two short ripostes to Cavigneaux's position, M.P. Streck has objected that an Akkadian word derived from the Semitic root **ḥyy* would not produce half-logographic writings such as the following:

ŠE-*e* (construct state before a genitive), ŠE-*u-šu* (nom. + S3 pronoun), ŠE-*a-šu* (acc. + S3 pron.), ŠE-*e*("my barley", + -ī, S1 pronominal suffix), ŠE-*im* (accusative in Mari).[16] Nor would a pre-form **ḥayyu* derived from the root **ḥyy* produce the form *ú-um*, as long /yy/ is protected from contraction.[17] It should produce a form **eyyu*, which might explain the Emar writings, but not the contracted form *ûm*. Therefore, according to Streck, the word *ûm* cannot be derived from **ḥyy*. It can however, be derived from Sumerian ú, "plant".[18] Although it would theoretically be possible to derive writings such as ŠE-*e* ("my barley") from Sumerian ú via an Akkadian borrowing, it is not necessary to do so, as the reading *še'u* can explain all contextual forms using the sign ŠE, according to Streck.[19] If the underlying word is *ûm*, a

10 Copy Arnaud 1985b: 468; transliteration Arnaud 1987: 49, ll. 92–98, 101 (Ur$_5$-ra II). While lines 92–97 and 101 all have *e-ia* as a construct case before a genitive, it is worth noting that l. 98 has še.babbar = *e-ia pa-ṣu-u* "white grain", where the writing *e*-IA is clearly nominative, presumably for *e*(*y*)*yû* or something similar.

11 Copy Arnaud 1985a: 137.

12 Copy Arnaud 1985b: 434; transliteration Arnaud 1987: 44, l. 238.

13 Vanstiphout 1989, van Soldt 1994, Livingstone 1997, Streck 1997, id. 1998.

14 Copy Arnaud 1985b: 468; transliteration Arnaud 1987: 50. CAD Š/2, 355.

15 van Soldt 1994: 39.

16 1997: 147–148. See below for list of attestations from CAD.

17 *GAG* §16b.

18 This suggestion had already been made by W. von Soden (AHw. 1398).

19 The borrowing would involve the insertion of a glide /y/ before certain endings and the regressive assimilation of the initial u- to that following glide. The examples given by Streck are: **u*/*ūyi* > *e*/*ēyi*, **u*/*ūyam* > *e*/*ēyam* > *êm* (Mari), *u*/*ūyī* > *e*/*eyī* (sic!) > *ê*. This does not

theoretical explanation, which resorts to a "plausible" phonetic development from a borrowed Sumerian ú, would be necessary to explain forms such as Mari ŠE-*im* (acc.) and Emar *e-ú*, *e-i*.[20]

A further argument is derived by Streck from the structure of Aa. That there are two Akkadian words corresponding to ŠE is made clear by the fact that the sign ŠE is to be read as phonetic Sumerian ú when corresponding to Akkadian *u-um*, but that it is to be read as Sumerian še-e when corresponding to Akkadian *še'um*.[21] Given that the form *še'u* can be used to explain all writings using the sign ŠE, Streck suggests that this was the normal word for "grain" in Akkadian, but that *ûm* was learned and restricted to lexical lists.[22]

In a similar vein, R. Borger books both *še'u* and *û* as Akkadian correspondents to Sumerian ŠE, the latter with the Sumerian reading u_{20} when corresponding to Akkadian *û*.[23] J. Huehnergard pronounced the debate as to the Akkadian word for "grain/barley" unsettled in the 2nd edition of his *Grammar of Akkadian* (2007). Most recently, J. M. Durand accepted that there was a word **eyûm*, as "une des façons de dire le grain" and that this was to be further associated with the name of the god Ea (to be read Aya), both ultimately being derived from the Semitic root for "live/life".[24]

The existence of a word *û*(*m*) is not contested by anyone, merely whether this was the only word for "grain" in Akkadian, attestations of ŠE-*um* etc. being logographic writings for *ûm*. In the following, I adduce some new or unnoticed evidence for the correspondence ŠE = *û*(*m*), followed by an attempt to review the question of etymology and the related question of which word lies behind the logogram ŠE.

2. Some New Lexical Evidence

As yet unnoted in the discussion are two passages from Middle Babylonian lexical lists. One is a fragment of Sª Vocabulary from Boğazköy: excavation no. 34/s, published as KBo 13.3[25]. It is presented in transliteration here. The other is the section on ŠE from an as yet unedited tablet of MB Aa from the Schøyen collection, also presented in transliteration for comparative pur-

explain the construct forms *e-ia* and ŠE-*e*, which would thus have to be analogical formations. Further examples of this type of borrowing in Akkadian are not given (Streck loc. cit.).

20 *e-ú* (Emar) is presumably to be included under the theoretical developments sketched here in the previous footnote, but is not mentioned by Streck in this part of his exposition.

21 The relevant text of Aa is reproduced below (section 2).

22 Streck 1998.

23 MZL no. 579 (2003).

24 Durand 2008: 223.

25 Photo B0073f, courtesy of the Projekt Hethitische Forschung, Akademie der Wissenschaften, Mainz, appears here as fig. 1. My thanks are due to G. Wilhelm for his permission to use this photo, and to J. L. Miller for sending it to me.



Figure 1 Photo B0073f, KBo 13.3.



Figure 2 Extract of MS 3178, Courtesy of The Schøyen Collection, Oslo and London, available at http://www.cdli.ucla.edu/dl/photo/P342645_d.jpg

poses.[26] The Boğazköy fragment 34/s was excavated in section L/18 of the lower city at Hattusa, belonging to the dump from Makridi's excavation of the House on the Slope. The Schøyen tablet is unprovenanced.

26 MS 3178, fig. 2. My thanks are due to A. R. George for alerting me to this. Photo in fig. 2 courtesy of The Schøyen Collection, Oslo and London, and now available at http://www.cdli.ucla.edu/dl/photo/P342645_d.jpg.

KBo 13.3 (34/s) rev. iv

col. I	col. II	col. III
(1) ⌜^{I}ŠE⌝[27]	ša-i	*i-ú*
(2) ⌜^{I}ŠE⌝		*uṭ-ṭa-a-t[um]*
(3) ^{I}ŠE	[(x x)]	*qa-qa-a-[du?]*
(4) ^{I}ŠE	[(x x)]	^{D}*aš-na-[an]*
(5) ^{I}ŠE	[(x x)]	*[m]a-ru-[ú]*
(6) ^{I}ŠE	[(x x)]	[ ]
(7) ^{I}ŠE	[(x x)]	[ ]
(8) ^{I}ÉŠ	[(x x)	]
(9) ^{I}TÚG		

MS 3178 rev. iv

(12) ^{I}ni-in-ni	ŠE	*ma-ru-u*
(13) ^{I}u	ŠE	*še-um*
(14) ^{I}uṭ-ṭe-tum	ŠE	*uṭ-ṭe-tum*
(15) ^{I}sag	ŠE	*ša* ésag *qa-ri-tum*
(16) ^{I}áš-na-an	ŠE	^{d}ŠE
(17) ^{I}še-e	ŠE	*še-um*

Here it is important not only to consider the direct equations presented by the lists, but the sections in which they occur as parts of individual text-performances from particular school traditions.

The Boğazköy fragment is the remainder of the top of column iv of the reverse of the tablet and is further subdivided into three sub-columns: sub-column I sign, sub-column II phonetic reading of sign, sub-column III Akkadian translation. This is the typical order of columns found in lexical texts from Boğazköy. Sub-column I has a vertical ruling at its left, which could be mistaken for a double-ruling in the hand-copy, but is in fact merely single. Ductus points to Boğazköy New Script type IIIbii and is to be dated to the 13th century.[28] The form of QA found here, with two "horizontals", is used by some scholars to date tablets to not earlier than Hattusili III (middle of 13th century).[29]

Typical of the Boğazköy ductus is the writing of TÚG for ÉŠ/ŠÈ, which is consistently kept separate from KU at Boğazköy by contrast to contemporary Middle Babylonian practice even in Syria. Contrast particularly the S^{a} Vocabulary from Emar, where ÉŠ is clearly written as KU.[30] There is thus no question of the fragment being an import from Mesopotamia, or from Syria.

The phonetic writing of sign ŠE as ša-i in the Boğazköy S^{a} fragment is slightly disconcerting from a phonetic perspective. This is likely to be a form

27 The convention using a superscript Roman numeral (I) to indicate the sign DIŠ when marking a new entry is selected purely for economy of space.

28 For the characterisation of Hittite palaeographic categories see Starke 1985: 21–27; Klinger 1995: 32–39, particularly p. 37–38 on DA and ID. In my doctoral Dissertation I suggest, on the basis of a re-dating of later categories of Hittite cuneiform, that the narrower chronological categories outlined in the afore-mentioned articles be adapted and refined into typological categories, without each necessarily having a chronological implication (Weeden 2007: 57). Category IIIbii indicates the presence of DA and/or ID with an unbroken central horizontal.

29 Van den Hout 1989: 342; Hazenbos 2003: 30.

30 Msk. 731064 + 7429a i 46 copy Arnaud 1985a: 140; Msk. 74158b obv. i 22 copy Arnaud 1985b: 389; transliteration Arnaud 1987: 13, l. 121.

of hyper-correction. Evidently the Hittite scribe heard the (Babylonian?) /e/-sound as broader and more dipthongised than a Hittite /e/. However, it is difficult to explain the Boğazköy form as a hypercorrection for something like /*eyyu*/ (Emar *e-ú*), because the fragment shows a completely different hypercorrection for /*e*/ namely the phonetic writing ša-i for /še/. It is unlikely that a scribe who heard /e/ as /ai/ would also hear /e/ as /i/. At least we cannot use the phenomenon of hypercorrection to explain both ša-i and *i-ú*.[31]

The Middle Babylonian Boğazköy fragment of S^a Vocabulary clearly corresponds to the tradition represented in manuscript A of first millennium S^a 386:[32]

DIŠ še-e = ŠE = *ú-um*.

The Schøyen tablet is a large four-columned tablet, with the ŠE section near the top of reverse column iv. It does not correspond in order completely with the Boğazköy S^a fragment, instead corresponding to the Neo-Babylonian Aa VII/4 as regards the position of the *marû*-entry. It contrasts with the Akkadian translation of ŠE (= u_{20}) as *ûm* at line 33 in the corresponding part of the late Aa VII/4:[33]

(31) ni-ig	ŠE	*ma-ru-ú*
(32)		*ka-ab-rum*
(33) ú	ŠE	*u-um*
(34) sa-ag	ŠE	*šá* ésag(ÉxŠE) *qa-ri-tum*
(35) áš-na-an	ŠE	*áš-na-an*
(36) še-e	ŠE	*še-um*

Instead of *ûm*, the MB version from the Schøyen collection has *še-um* in the Akkadian column in line 13, despite the reading u_{20} for the sign ŠE clearly being indicated in the phonetic Sumerian column. Thus the distinction between the equivalences ú = ŠE = *ûm* and še-e = ŠE = *še-um* is not binding for Aa after all.

The reading of ŠE as phonetic sag corresponding to Sumerian ésag (GÁxŠE, "granary") in MB Aa (Schøyen) rev. iv 15 also corresponds to the phonetic column of the section in late Aa VII/4 34.[34] The explanation preserved in the Akkadian column of the Aa tradition appears to have been misunderstood in Boğazköy S^a as being a writing for Sumerian saĝ, because it is equated with Akk. *qaqqadum*, "head" at KBo 13.3 rev. iv 3. This mistaken interpretation is interesting, as Hittite scribes were clearly acquainted with the sign ÉSAG,

31 See below for further considerations on the phonetic form at Boğazköy.
32 MSL 3.40, variant reading = *še*[-x].
33 MSL 14.466–7, 31–36.
34 MSL 14.467.

although they appear to have used it to denote underground storage pits rather than the clearly surface-standing structures denoted by Akkadian *qarītu* "granary".[35] This furnishes a neat illustration of how distant the relationship between "everyday" writing-practices and scholastic writing can be.

It is difficult to see how the Boğazköy S[a] fragment corresponds to the fragment of Middle Assyrian S[a] Vocab. from Assur (MSL 3.84, collated on tablet in Berlin), which clearly has a quite different text:

(4) [x]-*um* MEŠ
(5) [*uṭ*-]*ṭe-tu*
(6) [(x-)*ḫ*]*a*[?]-*a-pu/bu*
(7) [*še*-]*mu-ú*
(8) [*ma-g*]*a-ru*
(9) [*ma-r*]*u-ú*

The crucial first entry here is marked by MEŠ, which in peripheral writing traditions (e.g. Elamite) is used to denote that the foregoing word is a logogram or pseudo-logogram. This is of no help for the present inquiry, as the marking as a (pseudo)-logogram is necessitated solely by the use of mimation in line (4) [x]-*um*. We cannot therefore use this logographic marker (MEŠ) to decide whether the first sign in line 4 was [ŠE] or [U].[36]

The Boğazköy evidence shows again that there was an Akkadian word (*e*/*i*)*û*(*m*) corresponding to Sumerian še. The evidence does not demonstrate that the sign ŠE had to be read as Sumerian u_{20} when corresponding to (*i*)*û*(*m*), in the S[a] tradition at least, as še is clearly pronounced ša-i in the Boğazköy text. The Schøyen tablet, by contrast, shows that ŠE could be read as Sumerian u_{20} when corresponding to Akkadian *še*'*u*(*m*) even in the tradition of Aa. In fact it appears possible to identify the cleft between the two traditions of S[a] and Aa in this regard as follows: S[a] reads ŠE as Sumerian še (ša-i) but translates as Akkadian *ûm*, while Aa always reads ŠE as Sumerian u_{20}, even when translating *še-um*.

These data may support Streck's hypothesis that the Akkadian word *û*(*m*) is a more learned translation of ŠE than the word *še*'*um* is. Possibly Akkadian *û*(*m*) was not even known to the writer of MB Aa (Schøyen), or indeed the scribe of the variant manuscripts of first millennium S[a]. It is extremely unlikely that the Akkadian entry *še-um* at MB Aa (Schøyen) rev. iv 13 is to be read as Akkadian **u*$_{20}$-*um*. It is also unlikely that the writings in the Akkadian column of MB Aa (Schøyen) are to be read half-logographically. Both words (*e*/*i*)*û*(*m*) and *še*'*um*

35 A. Fairbairn/S. Omura 2005: 15–23 with previous literature.

36 In all likelihood, however, it was [ŠE], given that *še-um*(.MEŠ), *še-im*(.MEŠ) and *še-am* are used without regard for case as frozen spellings from the MA and MB periods onward according to CAD Š/2, 354. **u*/*ú-um*.MEŠ, by contrast, is not found.

existed in Akkadian by this account, and it is not necessary to assume a half-logographic writing ŠE-*um*, although that can never be excluded. However, the exclusion of superfluous assumptions is not the argument that always carries the greatest weight in linguistic discussion.

Hittite evidence suggests that *eû* (vel sim.) may have been far more frequent as a reading of the Sumerogram ŠE in Akkadian texts than apparent from the evidence thus far presented. In Hittite cuneiform, ŠE is certainly used half-logographically, as is usual, and is used to represent two different words. Contrast the regular ŠE$^{\text{ḪI.A}}$-*in* = *ḫalkin*, "barley"[37] with ŠE-*u-wa-an* = *ewan*- "a kind of grain".[38] One could even argue that the word *ewan*- was attracted to the logogram ŠE in Hittite writing on the basis of the corresponding Akkadian word (*eû?* – as at Emar) having a similar sound. A similar phenomenon occurs in the widely accepted account of the use of the Sumerian A.A, "water", "seed, sperm", for Hittite *muwa*- "strength, power": it is a rebus writing on the basis of Akkadian *mû*[39]. In light of this we might want to consider that *eû* may have lain behind ŠE more frequently than its attestations lead us to assume.[40]

3. The Question of the Etymology

We should thus take this opportunity to reconsider the etymological issues concerning the word *û*(*m*) in particular relation to the question of whether a half-logographic writing could ever be hiding behind ŠE-*um*, and to whether the new attestation from Boğazköy adds to what we can say about the phonological shape of this word. The fact that this is a triple weak root makes any such endeavour extremely difficult. The following cannot pretend to be any more than an evaluation of the types of available evidence.

The following writings are thus far attested for Akkadian *û*(*m*):

Old Babylonian: acc. *é-a-am* OB *Lu* A 57; *a-am* OB *Lu* B ii 13[41]

37 KUB 13.1 iv 8, a Middle Hittite composition in palaeographically Middle Hittite Script (abbreviated "MH/MS").

38 KUB 30.32 iv 16. Palaeography not entirely clear: S. Košak's Konkordanz (www.hethiter.net) has it as "mittelhethitisch", but it has the later New Script form of the sign DU. *ewan*- has been related to the Indo-European word for "grain/barley", *yéuo-. See last Kloekhorst 2008: 263–264 with reservations about the etymology.

39 CHD L-N 315–316.

40 Mention should also be made of the unique Hieroglyphic Luwian writing of the "barley"-sign (*179) in place of the sign *HWI* in the word *179-*ia-ta*$_x$ /(*h*)*uiyanta*/ (?) "they ran" at TOPADA §17. It is unclear how this hapax in a very obscure inscription is to be explained and I mention it only for the sake of completeness. See Hawkins 2000: 453, 457.

41 MSL 12.159; MSL 12.178.

Middle Babylonian: nom. *i-ú* (Boğ. S[a]); nom. *e-ú*, *e*-IA, constr. *e*-IA, gen. *e-i* (Emar *Hh*)[42]
Neo-Babylonian: nom. *u-um* (NB Aa)[43]
Neo-Assyrian: nom. *ú-um* (NA S[a])[44]

Clearly the Emar and Boğazköy writings preserve a form that is partially uncontracted. The Emar forms gave rise to the hypothesis of an etymology using the Semitic root *ḥyy, "life". Either the Boğazköy writing is a mishearing or dialectal representation of this, note the writing of ša-i for še in the same text, or it preserves a different form. The root *ḥyy, may give an explanation of the OB form *é-a-am* as an archaic writing preserving initial *ḥa-.[45]

In *NABU* loc. cit., Streck's main objection to a word derived from the root *ḥyy lying behind the allegedly half-logographic writing ŠE-*um*, is that the root *ḥyy would not produce the half-logographic writing ŠE-*e*. All forms, according to Streck, can be explained by assuming a base-word *še'um*. The relevant candidates for reading ŠE-*e* and related forms half-logographically are:[46]

acc. ŠE-*e šu-a-ti* (AbB 6.220, 28[47]); bánmin ŠE-*e* (MS 2200/13, 11)[48]
gen.: *aš-šum* ŠE-*e šu-a-ti* (AbB 6.220, 13); *ma-<aš>-ka-an* ŠE-*e šu-a-tu* (CT 52.167, 9, cf. AbB 7.167, 170, 171);
a-na ŠE-*e* (AbB 6.220, 27); *i-na* ŠE-*e* (TCL 18.110, 4); *ša* … ŠE-e (MDP 23.190, 3)
NB PN *na-din*-ŠE-*e* (Dar. 572, 13); cf. *na-din*-ŠE-*im* (TCL 13.195, 12); *na-din*-ŠE BRM 1.81, 12)
Construct: ŠE-*e* a.šà-*im*, "grain of the field" (AbB 4.93, 7, 12[49]); *ina* ŠE-*e šarrāqūtim* (TCL 18.90, 22)

42 For references see above.
43 MSL 14.467.
44 MSL 3.40.
45 On the use of the sign É to reproduce the sound /ḥa/ in the third millennium BC, see Hasselbach 2005: 80–81. With Streck 1997: 146, *a-am* would have to be a defective writing for *é-a-am*.
46 From CAD Š/2, 345–355; AbB 13/2.
47 Note ŠE-*am šu-a-ti* ibid. 35, ŠE-*um šu-ú* ibid. 38. It is possible that ŠE-*e šu-a-ti* in line 28 should be understood as +-*ī* "this my barley".
48 I am very grateful to S. Dalley for pointing this attestation out to me prior to her forthcoming publication of the Sealand-tablets from the Schøyen Collection.
49 CAD Š/2, 351 Ib2' for further examples.

Bound forms	with S1 pron.:	acc.:	ŠE-*e* (OECT 3.15, 19); (AbB 13/2.43, 10)
		gen.:	*a-na* ŠE-*e-ia* (AbB 6.220, 15)
	with S2 pron.	gen.:	*it-ti* ŠE-*e-ka* (AbB 1.89, 21[50])
	with P3m. pron.	acc.:	ŠE-*a-šu* (AbB 13/2.21)
	with P3f. pron.:	nom.:	ŠE-*ú-ši-na* (TMB 107. 209, 5)
		acc.:	ŠE-*a-ši-na* (TMB 107.210, 4; 212, 3)
			ŠE-*e-ši-na* (TMB 107.211, 4)

The texts are all Old Babylonian, with the exception of the writing of the personal name *na-din*-ŠE-*e*. It appears from the above distribution, especially if AbB 6.220, 28 in fact belongs under bound-forms suffixed with the S1 pronominal suffix, that the word hiding behind ŠE is behaving like a stem of the type (CVC[C])Ā*y*, most relevantly a *parrās* or a *parās* form of a third weak root in Babylonian.[51] Of these the Babylonian construct form ends in -*ê*,[52] as does the genitive singular *status rectus*, and the accusative/genitive plural. This also fully matches the triptotic declension with suffixed pronouns. Difficult here is ŠE-*e* from the Sealand tablet in the Schøyen collection, which cannot be anything other than accusative singular and cannot have an S1 personal pronoun as suffix.[53]

Given the weight of the evidence, we should be reviewing the assumption that the forms *e-ú*, *e-i*, *e-ia* should have been derived directly from a pre-form **ḥayyum*, rather than immediately assuming that the etymology by means of the root **ḥyy* is wrong.

The two nominative forms *e-ú* and *e*-IA (to be read *e-iu*) are presumably spellings of the same word perpetrated by different scribes.[54] They would by this account represent *e*(*y*)*yû*. However, if we use a pre-form ending in *-*āy* to explain our forms, both *e-ia* (construct) and *e-i* (genitive) would be the oddities in need of explanation. It is possible to read IA as -*ie*, which would give a construct form *e-ie* at Emar, presumably for *e*(*y*)*yê*.[55] The writing *e-i*

---

50 also ŠE-*a-am* ibid. 6, 21.

51 It is unclear to me how Streck's reading of the underlying word as *še'um* will produce a bound form with S1 pronominal suffix written ŠE-*e*. If anything this will produce **še'ī* (i.e written *ŠE-i). This is never once attested.

52 *GAG* §64 i.

53 S. Dalley suggests here a Mari-style /*ia*/ > /*ê*/ contraction (cf. OB Mari accusative ŠE-*em*) and alludes to further "northern" elements in the Sealand tablets (personal communication). On "northern" elements in a Late Old Babylonian tablet probably from Southern Mesopotamia see also George 2007: 63.

54 *e-iu pe-ṣu-u* Msk. 74191a obv. ii 42 vs. *e-ú* Msk. 731067 rev. 7 and Msk. 74171f, 5. *e-ia* in Msk. 74191a obv. ii 42 could also be written under the influence of the previous writings of the construct before genitive: *e-ia* in obv. ii 33–41.

55 The value /*ie*/ for IA is attested for Old Babylonian, Middle Assyrian and Neo-Assyrian according to von Soden/Röllig 1991: 13 (no. 104). Seminara 1998: 168, details that *yod* is always represented by IA at Emar. We should, however, take into account that Emar spellings possibly represent good Babylonian writings, due to the presence of at least one foreign

for the genitive is written by the same scribe on the same tablet only 5 lines after the series of construct and nominative forms written *e*-IA. The expected genitive from a stem-form -*āy* would also be **e*(*y*)*yê* (< **ḥayyāyim*/**ḥayāyim*), which we would see faithfully reflected in the Old Babylonian writing ŠE-*e*. The hapax *e*-*i* would have to be explained as a defective writing for **e*(*y*)*yê*.[56] This is, of course, less than satisfactory.

The objection that a pre-form **ḥayyum* (or indeed **ḥayyāyum*!) would not directly produce the late forms *u*/*ú*-*um* is certainly valid.[57] Here, however, the Boğazköy form *i*-*ú* may provide an intermediate stage. The phenomenon of apocope of /*a*/ before /(y)y/ is reasonably well attested: *ia*-*bi* from *ayyābī*[58], *ia*-*a*-*ku* from *ayakku*[59], *ia*-*a*-*lu* from *ayalu*[60], (*i*-)*ia*(-*a*)-*nu* from *ayānu*[61]. Quite possibly the Boğazköy form *i*-*ú* is an intermediary stage *yû* between *eyyû* and *û*. This is also not without its problems.[62]

We may thus have to find an explanation rooted in aberration to explain *ú*-*um* and *u*-*um*. Methodologically, however, I would argue that this is the correct emphasis. It is the older forms that we should begin with when considering an etymology and not the later ones. None of the proposed solutions is entirely satisfactory[63]. If we exclude a pre-form **ḥayyāyum* on the basis of *u*/*ú*-*um* we might fall back on the infinitive **ḥayāyum* > *e*'*û*(*m*) > *ûm*, but this would require a restitution of the /*y*/ to explain forms such as *e*-IA.

For the sake of completeness we might alternatively ask whether **ḥyy* has to be the only possible Semitic etymology of an Akkadian word *û*(*m*). Besides the hypothesis of a loan from Sumerian ú "grass" developing into **eyi* (and presumably to **eyē*), suggested by Streck as quoted above, we must also ask whether there are any other Semitic roots that could give rise to Babylonian

---

teacher at Emar, on which see Cohen 2004, especially p. 94 with reference to Kidin-Gula and the teaching of *Hh* at Emar.

56 I hesitate to ascribe *e*-*i* to an analogical re-modelling of the paradigm, as it is not at all clear to me how such an analogy would work. One could also simply emend to *e*-*i*<*a*>, with the value /*ye*/. Collation of the original may help here.

57 Streck 1997: 146–148.

58 AAA 19 pl. 77 no. 170, 6 (Shalm. I) CAD A/2 222.

59 PN é.an.na-UD-*er* (KAJ 170, 26) = *ia*-*a*-*ku*-UD-*er* (ibid. 11); ^{D}*BE*-*E*-*LAT A*-*IA*-*AK*-*KI* KUB 6.45 i 44, cf. ^{d}*be*-*lat ia*-*a*-*ki* KAR 214 ii 33 (NA) CAD A/2 225 (s.v. *ayakku*).

60 Hh 14.145–146a CAD A/2 225.

61 *ia*-*a*-*nu* PBS 7.29, 10 (OB letter), CAD A/2 227; *i*-*ia*-*nu*-*uš*-*šu* KUB 3.22, 8 (letter of Ramses II).

62 While the development *eyyû* to *yû* can be paralleled, there is no parallel for a further development to *û* with total loss of the initial semi-vowel. According to *GAG* §14a, there is almost no example of aphaeresis in really Akkadian words, although this is attested for loan-words (§14b). As regards Neo-Assyrian this information now needs to be updated on the basis of Luukko 2004: 121–122, where aphaeresis is shown to be slightly more widespread.

63 While derivation from a *parrās* or other similar form of **ḥyy* can explain most of the attested forms, including half-logographic ŠE-*e*, Streck claims that reading *še*'*u* can explain all forms using the sign ŠE (Streck 1997: 147). This is not entirely convincing to me, as **še*'*i* (gen.) is an entirely plausible form, but unattested.

û(*m*) and half-logographic ŠE-*e*, both from the semantic and the diachronic phonological perspectives.

Another Semitic root that would give a construct ŠE-*e* and might explain Emar *e-ú*, *e-ia* and the Boğazköy *i-ú*, would be **y*^c^*y* "to sweep together, gather, collect". (Arabic *wa*^c^*ā*, "hold, contain, remember"; *wi*^c^*ā'* "container, vessel"[64], Hebr. *y*^c^*h* "sweep together", *y*^c^ "shovel", Aram. *ya*^c^*ā* "scraper, sweeper"[65]).

The context would thus be "that which is swept up (eg. from the threshing floor)". One might also have to countenance two separate developments **ya*^c^*yum* > *e'û*, **ya*^c^*ay* > *eya*, with a final support vowel, as at Emar, as opposed to **ya*^c^*yum* > *iû*, as at Boğazköy. This is not impossible with a triple-weak root, but undesirable. The semantic fields of the cognates (sweeping up hail in Hebrew, mental activity in Arabic!) are also not at all satisfactory.

4. Evidence from Ebla

M.P. Streck (*NABU* loc. cit.) mentions the entry in a lexical text from Ebla: še.šu.ra = NI-*a*-*u*[*m*], še.šu.si = NI-*a*-⸢x⸣ at MEE 4, VE 695a–b, where the Ebla-Akkadian had also been connected with Akkadian *ûm* by M. Krebernik.[66] Three manuscripts of the lexical list known as VE (A, B^{ai}, D) spell the Eblaite word identically. Could this be */yaʿyum/ or */ḥayyum/? The one possibility that would be immediately ruled out by this, if it is indeed connected to the word for "grain", would be the derivation from Sumerian ú, "grass".

Aside from the difficulties in understanding the Sumerian column (še.šu.ra), the phonology of the Ebla-Akkadian word is extremely problematic due to the obscure Eblaite orthography, especially in the case of the sign NI. M. Krebernik lists the possible values as bu_x, *ì*, *'*a_x, *'*u_x, *ni*, *lí* (?).[67] G. Conti's study of the syllabary used by the idiosyncratic ms. D of the lexical list VE indicated that *a*, *i*, u_9 are used to denote the glide /y/ on this tablet, and not ì (NI).[68] In 1996 Krebernik made a distinction in Eblaite orthography more generally between *i*, which is used to denote */yi/* and *ì*, which represents /'i/ and /'i/.[69]

The entire issue is redundant if we follow Conti and P. Fronzaroli in reading Eblaite NI-*a-um* as /'alāyum/, with the meaning "conserve (of cereals)", referring to Tigre 'aläyä "to guard", as well as to the Ebla use of the Sumerian šu.ra in connection with administrative activities.[70] šu.ra is also glossed with Eblaite *wa-'à-um*, which Fronzaroli explains etymologically with reference to Geʿez

64 Wehr 1971: 1082.
65 HALOT 2.419.
66 Krebernik 1996: 22 fn. 14.
67 Krebernik 1982: 198–9.
68 Conti 1990: 19.
69 Krebernik 1996a: 237 fn. 9. See also Rubio 2006: 116.
70 Fronzaroli 1989: 8–9.

waḥaya, "to inspect"[71].This is not entirely convincing, given that the comparability of šu.ra with še.šu.ra is not clear. It is difficult to see why šu.ra the verb should be directly comparable to what appears to be a noun, še, qualified by the verb/verbal noun šu.ra.

Nevertheless, the evidence collected by Conti regarding the representation of the glide in manuscript D is convincing enough to reject a connection between any kind of supposed **ya*^{c}*yum* "that which is swept together, grain" and Eblaite NI-*a-u*[*m*]. Furthermore, the Ebla syllabification may require a tri-syllabic word structure.

We should compare the Semitic writing of the god's name ^{d}en.ki, which is spelled *'à-u*$_9$ in the same lexical list from Ebla (ibid. VE 803) presumably representing phonetic **ḥayyu*, and using the regular 3rd millennium writing of É for /ḥa/.[72] Given Eblaite sound-"homography", it would be rash to assume that a writing of **ḥayyum* for ^{d}en.ki as *'à-u*$_9$ excludes that a **ḥayyum* meaning "corn" could be written as *'*a*$_x$(NI)-*um*. We do, however, still need to account for the trisyllabic structure of '*a*$_x$(NI)-*a-um*. This could be provided for by assuming an agent-noun formation /*ḥayyāyum*/, "the life-bringer" (vel sim.), or **ḥayāyum* meaning, for example "living/life-process".

Speculation about etymological meaning may be very tenuous indeed, but one should remember that Ebla NI-*a-um*, whatever it represents phonetically, does not correspond simply to še "grain, barley", but to še.šu.ra, "grain or barley that has had something done to it". Whatever the meaning of the Sumerian compound verb at Ebla, literally to "hit with the hand", the kinds of processing that suggest themselves are "grinding" (Sumerian àr) or "threshing", unless it is a matter of the administrative process denoted by šu.ra elsewhere at Ebla referred to above.[73]

5. Ḫaya, Spouse of Nissaba

Also to be considered here, as D. Schwemer kindly points out to me, is the connection of Ḫaya, the spouse of Nissaba, the grain-goddess, with the alleged complex *e*(*y*)*yû* "grain" and **ḥyy* "life". A priori grounds lead us to support this association, but may imply an irregular treatment of Semitic *ḥa as Akkadian /ḫa/. The name Ḫaya, which has been supposed to be clearly of Semitic origin, is almost always spelled ^{d}ḫa-ià.[74] While explanations could certainly be found

71 Fronzaroli loc. cit. 9, but cf. Krebernik 1996: 22.

72 Hasselbach 2005: 80–81.

73 Karahashi 2000: 165–167, has šu … ra used of churning milk and patting clay into tablet shape. Durand 2008: 223, sees (West Semitic?) *ayûm* as "le grain qu' on gardait pour en vivre …", as opposed to *dagnum* "… celui qui était semé et se trouvait en terres pour produire les futures récoltes".

74 Galter 1983: 134.

for this (see below), a brief investigation of the writings of this divine name is in order, as is an assessment of the evidence linking him with grain, as this is not quite as manifest as one might think.

In the god-list AN: ^{d}A-nu-um, preserved on first millennium manuscripts, $^{[d]}$ḫa-ià appears as an official of Enlil, corresponding to the potentially Semitic deity ^{d}⸢lugal⸣.[ki-sá-a].[75] He is further the father of Ninlil and his wife is Nissaba:[76]

289	^{d}⸢lugal⸣.[ki-sá-a]	$^{[d]}$ḫa.ià AGRIG ^{d}enlil(BAD).lá
289a		a.a ^{d}nin.líl.lá.ke$_4$
(…)		
293	^{d}ḫa.ià	["]
294	^{d}nissaba (ŠE+NAGA) dam.bi.SAL	

Not only is ^{d}ḫa-ià the spouse of Nissaba, the name also occurs in the god list An: *Anu ša amēli* (II 97–98), spelled ^{d}ḫa-a-a/[^{d}*ḫ-a-a*]-*u*, as a name of one of two aspects of Nissaba:[77]

97	^{d}ŠE.NÁG	^{d}nissaba (ŠE.NÁG)	*šá né-me-qí* ("of wisdom")
98	^{d}*ḫa-a-a*	^{d}nissaba (ŠE.NÁG)	*ša maš-re-e* ("of wealth")

(dupl. [^{d}*ḫa-a*]-*u*)

D. O. Edzard understood the two explanations in col. III as referring to Nissaba's two aspects as patroness of scribal art (i.e. wisdom) and of grain (i.e. wealth) respectively[78]. Furthermore the writings on these Neo-Assyrian manuscripts may indicate that there were two forms of the name in the first millennium: Ḫayyu, Ḫayya[79]. The correspondence is complemented by OB Diri (Nippur) Seg. 10, 34:

---

75 Lambert 1987–1990: 146; Such-Gutíerrez 2003/1: 34, appears to support a Sumerian interpretaton "Herr der Stützmauer". Lambert supposes that Lugal-kisa'a may only have been secondarily associated with Ḫaya, as he appears in the society of door-keepers in the OB forerunner to An : *Anum* (TCL 15.10, 308–322). ^{d}ḫa-ià, however, receives an offering together with the gate (ká) in the cult of the temple of Nanna at Ur (Sallaberger 1993/2: 38, Table 16).

76 Litke 1998: *An = Anum* I 288–293.

77 Litke 1998: 235.

78 Edzard 1972–1975: 1. Edzard also appears to wish to keep "Ḫa-a-a", as attested here, separate from "^{d}ḫa-ià". Despite Edzard's reference to an RlA article on "Ḫaja", one never appeared in that series, as far as I can see.

79 Litke loc. cit. fn. 98, also refers to a ^{d}ḫa-a immedialtely following ^{d}nissaba in KAV 65 iv 8. There is in fact a paragraph divider between ^{d}nissaba and ^{d}ḫa-a on this tablet. ^{d}ḫa-a is directly followed by ^{d}ašnan.

[[ḫa-ia?]] ᵈḪA-NI *ḫa-a-a-um*[80]

with a marked plene-writing, indicating a pronunciation *ḫayyum* or possibly *ḫayyā'um*.

The earliest attestation of the divine name ᵈḫa-ià is from the Fara-period (ED IIIa, 26th century BC).[81] The Fara school-tablet SF 77 is famous for its exquisite drawing on the reverse.[82] The tablet is generally interpreted as a school exercise in writing vaguely homophonous signs.[83] The writing ᵈḫa-ià occurs allegedly either ending a section of entries apparently connected by the sounds /a/ and /z/ or heading the next section of seven entries all characterised by the sign IB. Quite what role ᵈḫa-ià is playing here is for the moment impossible to gauge, especially if the function of the exercise should be to learn homophonous signs.

SF 77 iv 10 - v 6 transliteration
(iv 10) A GÁ ZI (11) A EZEN (12) UD.UD EZEN[84] (13) A IZI (14) IZI.IZI A (iv 15) ᵈḫa-ià[85] (16) ŠU-IB (v 1) BU-IB (2) BÍ-IB (3) BÍ-IB-ḪA[86] (4) BÍ-IB-KA (5) ḪUR-IB (6) ḪUM-IB

The sign-order at Fāra is still free within the text-boxes. One is tempted to interpret the A signs in (iv 10) to (iv 14) as Sumerian locatives, although they would have to be morphographemic writings: "in my life" (zi.ĝá-a), "in the festival" (ezen.a), "the bright festival" (ezen dadag), "in the fire" (izi.a), "in the fires" (izi.izi.a). One might wonder whether the following IB sequence could not be Akkadian S3 pret. verb forms with ᵈḫa-ià as subject, eg. (v 1) *ippu*(*ḫ*) "he blew" (vel sim.) (2) *ibbi* "he named" (3) *ibbi'a*(*m*) "he named for me" (4) *ibbīka* "he named you" (5) *ipḫur* "he collected". This leaves (iv 16) ŠU-IB and (v 6) ḪUM-IB without explanation.[87] A ventive form *ibbi'am* is also unattested.

This interpretation would mean a comparatively large increase in the amount of Semitic material found at Fāra, which is unexpected, and would also offend against third millenium orthography, which tends to avoid mark-

80 MSL 15.36; Tablet 3N-T299 (ibid. 11); Green 1975: 75
81 Noted by Galter 1983: 134 fn. 67, contra Green 1975: 75, where an appearance of Ḫaya before the Ur III period is denied.
82 SF 77 (VAT 9128) obv. iv 15. Published as Deimel 1923: 72 (no. 77), and now available at www.cdli.ucla.edu/dl/photo/P010673.jpg.
83 Lambert 1953: 85–86; Jestin 1955.
84 Jestin 1955: 38 à izi(n) reading the first sign as PI. The sign appears to be UD over UD, however, possibly dadag, "bright".
85 It is read as a(n)-ḫa-zal and transplanted to line (11) by Jestin 1955: 38.
86 Jestin 1955: 38 bí-ib-ku_6.
87 *ipšu*(*ḫ*) "he cooled down" is excluded because it has an etymological /s/, when a dental affricate is required to fit the Fāra writing.

ing double consonants. It is thus highly speculative. It would also call for a major re-interpretation of this tablet, given that what seems to be a kind of incantation had suddenly appeared in its middle.

The most frequent attestations of Ḫaya are in the Ur III period, after which his cult seems to have faded somewhat until the late period.[88] A cult to Ḫaya is attested during the Ur III period at Umma[89], Ur[90] where the cult-centre may well have been located in the Temple of Nanna, and Ku'ara[91]. A further tablet from Umma without year-name details 2 sheep as an offering for (/of) ^{d}ḫa-ià, with the qualification zì.da ku$_4$.ra, "brought in with the flour(-offering)".[92]

In the Old Babylonian hymn to Ḫaya, from Ur, the name is similarly always spelled ^{d}ḫa-ià and by this time at the latest the association with Nissaba and the scribal art is securely concretised.[93] There is in fact no trace of ^{d}ḫa-ià being a grain-god in this, the main OB composition in his honour. Elsewhere in OB scholastic literature from Nippur we have the ^{d}ḫa-ià$^{\text{mušen}}$, or "peacock", whose cry "ḫaya" is also written ^{d}ḫa-ià$^{\text{mušen}}$. [94]

Furthermore, giš ^{d}ḫa-ià also occurs at OB Hh 1 (GIŠ) 146, a transitional section, later the beginning of Hh 4, which N. Veldhuis has argued to concern itself with names for instruments of scribal education.[95] While the nature of the object concerned is not clear, the presence of ^{d}ḫa-ià in its name is argued by Veldhuis to be a result of his association with Nissaba as patroness of scribal art.

There may be one possible Middle Babylonian case where the name Ḫaya is spelled differently to its usual ^{d}ḫa-ià, and where the connection with grain would be made crystal clear if we could attach it securely to this complex. In a Hattic invocation on a tablet found at Boğazköy,[96] we encounter the

---

88 Galter 1983: 136.

89 Sallaberger 1993/2: 168 (Table 99a).

90 Sallaberger 1993/2: 38 (Table 16 – animal offerings); 39 (Table 17 – fruit baskets); 111 (Table 63a – fruit baskets).

91 Sallaberger 1993/2: 134 (Table 77).

92 NISABA 9/95 rev. 1–2 (Molina/Such-Gutiérrez 2005: 97). For the phrase "X.da ku$_4$-ra" see Sallaberger 1993/1: 148. Although it is suggestive that a sacrifice to ^{d}ḫa-ià is made when the flour is offered, it is not permissible to generate a particularity of ^{d}ḫa-ià on the basis of the kind of offering (flour) that his animal-sacrifice accompanies in this one case.

93 Spelling UET 6.101, 2 et passim. See Charpin 1986: 334–357, proposing that the hymn was composed for the occasion of a visit by Rīm-Sîn to the cella of Ḫaya at the Ekišnugal of Nanna at Ur; Brisch 2007: 186–198, provides a new edition with discussion of the poem's literary merits at loc. cit. 58–61. See also ^{d}ḫa-ià lú dub-ba-ke$_4$, "Ḫaia the man of the tablet" at Nanše A 110 (http://etcsl.orinst.ox.ac.uk, Text C.4.14.1).

94 Veldhuis 2004: 251–252. N. Veldhuis does not connect either the call or the name of the bird with any alleged function of ^{d}ḫa-ià. Could it be that the peacock is calling out for "grain"?

95 see Veldhuis 1997: 223, for OB Nippur Hh 1 [GIŠ] 146. At Boğazköy it is spelled <d>ḫa$^{!}$(ZA)-ià in the lexical list MB Hh 1 (GIŠ) at KBo 26.5 B ii 10, a prism showing signs of a transmission through Syria (ibid. Bi 6 *si-ia-tum* for *šiqdu*). Clearly the divine name was obscure to the scribe. It is difficult to infer anything of import for our investigation from this, however.

96 KUB 28.75 iii 25–28 (OS).

Hattic goddess Ka-i-it, known thus to mortals, but who appears as ḫa-a-ia-am-ma among the gods. The deity is certainly female, as she has the title ka-at-ta-aḫ, "queen".[97] The invocation is introduced by the following Hittite words invoking Halki, the Hittite grain-god, who is equated with Nissaba at Hattusa:[98]

ma-a-an A-NA ḫal-ki-ia ḫu-e-ek-zi ^{LÚ}GUDU$_{12}$*-ša me-ma-i*
"when he invokes Halki too, the priest still says".

The text continues with an invocation in Hattic, part of a series of identically structured invocations (CTH 733.I), many of which are translated in preserved Hittite parallel texts (CTH 733.II). The deity's name "among mortals" (Hattic ḫa-pí-pu-na-a-an // Hitt. *da-an-du-ki-iš-ni*) is followed by their name "among the gods" (Hattic ḫa-wa$_a$-aš-ḫa-wi$_i$-i-pí // Hitt. DINGIR^{MEŠ}*-na-na iš-tar-na*). The Hittite translation of this particular couplet is lost, but it is clear that ḫa-a-ia-am-ma is the name of the grain-goddess Ka-i-it among the gods.[99]

A derivation of ḫa-a-ia-am-ma from Ḫaya, the spouse of Nissaba, although not entirely satisfactory, is reasonable.[100] However, it is also possible that the name has its own Hattic etymology. In the same text, the "mortal" name le-e-^{D}UTU, for example, corresponds to "divine" ka-aš-ba-ru-u-ia-aḫ, which is translated as Hitt. *lalu*[*kkima*-] "shining light"[101]; the Hattic "mortal" name ^{D}wa$_a$-še-ez-zi-li corresponds to "divine" ták-ke-e-ḫal, which is translated as Hitt. UR.MAḪ-*aš* "lion"[102]. It is not always the case, however, that an ordinary Hattic/Hittite word is used as the "divine" name. Proper names too, can apparently be used. Compare "mortal" Hattic ^{D}ta-ši-im-me-et = "divine" Hattic ^{D}ti-im-me-et with Hitt. "mortal" *ta-ši-im-me-ti-iš* = "divine" Hitt. ^{D}*IŠTAR-iš*.[103] If the latter is the case then we can use ḫa-a-ia(-)am-ma as evidence for Ḫaya the spouse of Nissaba in the function of grain-deity.

In the late period the cult of ^{d}ḫa-ià appears to have been revived, although there is only evidence for his characterisation as a scribe god.[104] As such Sennacherib builds him a temple, and it is surely in this role that he presides over a procession of the "gods of the land of Subartu" during an unidentified festival at Assur.[105]

97 Klinger 1996: 176; further literature at Soysal 2004: 426.
98 Hoffner 1974: 84f.; Kammenhuber 1991: 143–160.
99 For the structure of the phrases see Kammenhuber 1969: 490.
100 The borrowing would either have to have been in the accusative, or ḫa-a-ia(-)am-ma contains an unexplained Hattic element, possibly an epithet (Ḫāya amma, "mother Ḫāya"?).
101 KUB 28.75 obv. ii 22 // KBo 25.112 obv. ii 12; see E. Neu StBoT 26 [1983] 325 fn. 11.
102 KUB 28.75 rev. iii 13 // KBo 25.112 rev. iii 16.
103 KUB 28.75 iii 9–10 // KUB 8.41 ii 8–9, OS.
104 Menzel 1981/I: 79.
105 ibid. 139, 243.

Thus an association of ^{d}ḫa-ià with grain independent of the pairing with Nissaba cannot be demonstrated conclusively for the third millennium and is clearly eclipsed by an association with scribal craft in Mesopotamia by the Old Babylonian period. It cannot be decided whether the Middle Babylonian Hattic association with the grain-goddess, if it is to be accepted, should be attributed to a preservation of an original identity of ^{d}ḫa-ià or to borrowing from a by this time independent West Semitic deity.

6. Ḫa(y)ya in Personal Names

It is impossible to tell if the name *a-a-um*(-KU.LI) from Tell Abu Ṣalābīḫ can be interpreted as *Ḥayyum*(-KU.LI), and whether this would then be a case of a Ḫaya- or of an Ea-name.[106] The fact that Ea may have been written É at Tell Abu Ṣalābīḫ is not necessarily probative one way or the other.

Ḫay(y)a forms an element in personal names of usually West Semitic origin, being derived from the root *ḥy/wy "life". It is also used to form compound names using the name of the god ^{d}ḫa-ià. Almost exclusively the second type are found in the Ur III period:

Umma: ḫa-ià[107], ^{d}ḫ⌜a⌝/-ià (kišib –)[108], ^{d}ḫa-ià-IGI.DU[109], *ḫa-um*-ì.sa$_6$ (= *Ḫay-yum-damiq*?)[110] lú-^{d}ḫ a-ià[111]
Ur: *pù-zur*$_8$-^{d}ḫa-ià[112]
Puzriš-Dagan: ur-^{d}ḫa-ià[113]
Old Babylonian period: ^{d}ḫa-ià-*mu-ša-lim*[114] , ^{d}ḫa-ià-*ra-bi*[115]

According to R. Pruzsinszky, the West Semitic personal names from Emar using the elements *ḥaia*- (ḥayya from **ḥyy*) and *au*- (from root allomorph **ḥwy*) are, besides names in *rabbi/a*, the only ones to break the rule that subjects of

---

106 KU.LI is interpreted by some as the man's profession, see lit. at Krebernik 1998: 265 fn. 288.
107 *MVN* 20.28, rev. 4.
108 *SETUA* 281, 5 (Zang 1973: 302). No other Semitic names.
109 *MVN* 4.31 rev. 1. Hilgert 2002: 278 fn. 34, may be directed at this entry among others, when he says he is reluctant to consider all names built with the participle of *pll to be Akkadian.
110 *UMTBM* 1.139, 9, D'Agostino/Pomponio 2002: 137. List of rations for messengers. Other potential overtly Semitic names on the same tablet are: *a-da-*⌜*làl*⌝ (2); *a-ḫu-ni* (5); *en-um-ì-lí* (7); *šu-é-a* (8).
111 *SETUA* 50, 7, etc. This very prolific official, son of Ur-e$_{11}$-e, is part of the elite family from Umma studied by J. Dahl (2007: 96–103).
112 *UET* 3.1673, 9. See further Galter 1983: 134.
113 ITT 2.3645, 3. See further Galter loc. cit.; Dahl 2007b: 35–36.
114 YOS 2.47, 9.
115 CT 4.9a, 36.

predicative phrases are placed first in sentence-names:[116] *Ḥaia-'aḫu* (spelled *a-ia-*(*a/a'*)-*ḫi/u*), "the brother is alive".[117]

At OB Mari the element Ḫa(y)ya occurs in proper names, but also most frequently in predicative function, meaning "(is) alive". It is more often spelled with the initial *ḫa-*, which has been lost at Emar, as well as frequently being additionally spelled with the sign *-ià* (= NI) usually used in the divine name ᵈḫa-ià.[118] However, there are plenty of cases where West Semitic *Ḥaya-* as name-predicate is spelled *a-ia-* at OB Mari, just as later at MB Emar.[119] This is likely to reflect an attempt to reproduce a phoneme not represented in the syllabary, possibly /*ḥ*/.

Ḫaya is never preceded by a divine determinative, and therefore can never be demonstrably related to the god ᵈḫa-ià, although it is common that West Semitic god-names are written without the divine determinative at Mari (e.g. Asumû).

One oddity is the name Ḥa(y)yum-rapi, which not only gives us a nominative declined form of the root, albeit spelled with the sign PI (= *-iu-*), but also appears to be in subject position.[120] It is difficult to decide whether this is to be understood as "Ḫayum (is the) healer" (alternatively Ḫayum-rabi, "Hayum (is) great") or as "Life is the healer" (or "Life is great"). We should compare the Ur III name from Umma, listed above: *ḫa-um-*i.$ša_6$ for the form of *ḫay*(*y*)*um* and OB ᵈḫa-ià-*ra-bi/pí* for the apparent equivalence ᵈḫa-ià- = *ḫa-*(*iu*)-*um-*.

In the case of the name Ḫaya-malik at Mari, however, J.-M. Durand has recently decided that the name is to be understood as built on a divine name Ḫaya, on the basis of comparison with the name type Ea-malik "Ea is prince". This proper name he also extends to names such as ᶠḪaya-libūra "May Ḫaya live".[121] The value of the name Ḫaya-malik in determining the status of a god

116 See Pruzsinszky 2003: 199. An alternative interpretation is consistently provided at Radner 1998: 89–94, where the onomastic element *a-ia-* either represents the god Ea or a West Semitic element meaning "where is?".

117 Pruzsinszky 2003: 201 fn. 499.

118 ARM 16/1 [1979], 105–106: *ḫa-a-ia-a-bu-um*, *ḫa-a-ia-a-ba-am*, *ḫa-ia-a-ba-am* "the father is alive"; *ḫa-ià-*ᵈIŠKUR "Addu is alive"; *ḫa-a-ià-i-lu-ú* "the god is alive"; *ḫa-ià-IŠDAR* "Ištar is alive"; *ḫa-ià-ku-ba-ba* "Kubaba is alive"; *ḫa-ià-ma-*AN "El is indeed alive"; *ḫa-ià-*ᵈ*m*[*a-a*]*m-m*[*a*] "Mamma is alive"; *ḫa-ia/ià-su*(*-ú*)*-mu*(*-ú*) "Sumu is alive". Alternatively these theophorics may be understood as "he (the child) lives! O DN".

119 ARM 16/1 [1979], 71 *a-ia-*(*a-*)*ḫu-*(*um*)/*ḫi-*(*im*) is of course directly comparable to Emar. See further *a-ia-da-du* "Dadu lives"; *a-ia-ḫa-lu* "Halu lives"; *a-ia-ḫa-mu-ú* "Ḫammu lives"; *a-ia-la-su-mu-ú* "he lives for Asumû"; *a-ia-ma-el*, *a-ia-ma-*AN "El is indeed alive"; *a-ia-um-mi* "my mother is alive".

120 *ḫa-iu-um-ra-pí* (ARM 8.24, 12; 21.266, 4; 24.224 ii 7; *ḫa-a-iu-um-ra-pí* 21.242, 10; 401, 5.

121 Durand 2008: 675. The god "*ḫayûm*" is supplied with two ** in Durand's index (2008) to signify that the attestation given in ARM 16/1 has been revised on the basis of an error of interpretation.

Ḫaya at Mari is lessened, however, due to the fact that this is the name of an Assyrian eponym, and thus not definitely a local formation.[122]

Late Old Babylonian usage from Alalaḫ VII shows an alternation between *a-ia-* and *ḫa-ia-*, also possibly indicating an attempt to reproduce the phoneme /Ḥ/ in the spelling of the name Aya-šarri, son of Ammu-Addu.[123] This is an Ea-name, the treatment of which can be compared with that of Ea-names from the first millennium.

Names using the West Semitic root **ḥw/y* are relatively frequent in the first millennium.[124] The late theophoric element used in the NA name gír-ḫa-a, "client of Ḥay" is almost certainly referring to a different (West) Semitic deity to the Ḫaya under consideration here. By contrast, Neo-Assyrian names beginning in *a-ia-* are frequently attested, either as constructions rooted in West Semitic onomastic elements[125] or as writings of Ea-names.[126] Ea-names could be written logographically (^{d}É.A) or syllabically as *a-ia-* or *ia-*.[127]

The unusual use of -ià in the spelling of the predicative name-element "lives" at Mari either indicates that ^{d}ḫa-ià has become confused with this, or that a relationship between a god Ḫaya and the (West) Semitic root for "life" was clear. We do not necessarily need to assume that a completely different god, *Ḫayyum*, has been born.

Durand, for example, argues further that the spouse of Nissaba at Mari according to the text of the Ur III Mari Pantheon, is likely to be ^{d}SUMUQAN, pronounced Šaḫan, and not Ḫaya.[128] By this account, Ḫaya at Mari would have had to have a different god as referent, which Durand suggests to have also been derived from the root for "life".[129]

---

122 Šamšī-Adad conquered Mari in the eponymate of Ḫaya-malik, see Günbattı 2008: 116.

123 *a-ia*-lugal AlT 243, 22 (Zeeb 2001: 501); AlT 274, 4 (Zeeb 2001: 519); *a-ia*-lugal-*ri* ATT 80/14, 6 (first published Zeeb 2001: 557); *a-ia-aš*[!]*-šar-ri* AlT 268, 23 (Zeeb 2001: 573); *ḫa-ia-aš-šar-*[*ri*] ATT 81/8, 2 (first published Zeeb 2001: 567). Zeeb 2001: 280 fn. 311, considers Aya-šarri and Ḫaya-šarri to be identical.

124 Zadok 1977: 67. For use of the verb in West Semitic names see ibid. 89 (N/LB) *Bēl-aḫ-ḫi-ia-a-ni-'* "the lord makes me live"; ibid. 92 (NA) *iá-ḫi-ìl* S3m causative (?); 158 (hypocoristic). Parpola apud Radner 1998: 89–94.

125 Note Parpola apud Radner 1998: 89–94, *a-ia-* consistently translated as "where is?" rather than being derived from the root **ḥw/yy*. This makes good sense in terms of onomastics, but loses the connection with **ḥw/yy*.

126 Radner 1998: 89–94. See also discussion of Ea-names at loc. cit. xxv to xxvii. The chart (I) contains only names that are attested in Neo-Assyrian.

127 Parpola apud Radner 1998: xxvi–xxvii, chart I. This chart contains Ea-names that are attested in Neo-Assyrian and maps their spellings elsewhere. The *a-ia-* spellings in Neo-Assyrian are explained either as being due to West Semitic influence reflecting an original pronunciation /*Ḥayyā*/, or as a Neo-Assyrian phonological development (loc. cit xxvii). The appearance of at least one of these names in a Late Old Babylonian context (Aya-šarru), should make the former a more likely scenario.

128 Durand 2008: 251.

129 Durand loc. cit. 675: ""le vivant", désigne le dieu ressuscité? cf. NP ^{f}*ha-ia-li-bu-ra*, M. 8009 (XXX)". It is not immediately convincing that the spouse of Nissaba at Mari was ^{d}SUMUQAN

7. ᵈḫa-ià, Ea and *Ḥayyā

An identification of ᵈḫa-ià with Ea was proposed by M. Civil, due to the fact that Ea does not receive offerings in the Ur III period whereas ᵈḫa-ià does, and that Ea is only attested in personal names.[130] We can, however, never know if the god receiving the offering was not in fact Ea written logographically as ᵈEN.KI. The identification of Ea and ᵈḫa-ià was rejected by H. Galter on the basis that the ᵈḫa-ià of the Fāra period (ED IIIa) must have been a Sumerian god.[131] However, there is more than a little evidence for Semitic presence at ancient Šuruppak (Fāra), although it is much smaller than that at contemporary Tell Abu Šalābīkh.[132] Notwithstanding a Semitic origin, Ḫaya could still have become a Sumerian god, with an established Sumerian writing: ᵈḫa-ià.

Unfortunately we do not have a writing of ᵈḫa-ià at Tell Abu Ṣalābīkh, where it appears by contrast that the name of the god Ea may have been written in abbreviated form as -É in the second element of composed names.[133] A writing of Ea with É at Fāra would also have made a separation of the two gods from the earliest period a very convincing option.[134] Clearly, however, from the earliest period, we only have evidence for Ea being spelled with É- (*'à*-), namely at Ebla and perhaps Tell Abu Ṣalābīkh, and we only have clear evidence for ᵈḫa-ià being spelled with ḪA-, namely at Fāra.

With regard to spelling at least, the indications are that Ur III *é-a*, in the name Šū-Ea is to be kept distinct from ḫayyum. The spellings *šu-é-a* and *ḫa-um*-i.sa_6 occur in consecutive lines of the same text.[135] If Ea was pronounced *Ḥayyā* here, the writing must be a traditional one.

Almost universal agreement has been found for the supposition that the name written É-A was pronounced *Ḥayyā* in the third millennium, and ⁽'⁾*Aya* further on in the second millennium at least at Mari.[136] Hurro-Hittite evidence is also frequently adduced, although this must be treated cautiously.[137]

---

according to the so-called "Pantheon". For further discussion of this text see Lambert 1985: 525–539.

130 Apud Green 1975: 75 fn. 4. Civil 1983: 44. A full investigation of this topic exceeds the remit of this essay. Detailed studies of Ea are Galter 1983 and, for the third millennium, Espak 2006, where the investigation of ᵈḫa-ià is not pursued in detail (ibid. 101–103).

131 Galter 1983: 136.

132 Krebernik 1998: 260–270. If the interpretation offered above of SF 77 iv 10-v 6 carries any weight, it puts ᵈha-ià in the middle of a Semitic context.

133 Krebernik 1998: 266 fn. 324: *i-ti*-É; $PUZUR_4$-É; *im-lik*-É.

134 It is likely that É was used at Fāra to write the syllable *'à*-, but all examples of this given at Krebernik 1998: 289, are provided with question-marks.

135 UMTBM 9.139, 8–9.

136 For discusson of Ḥayyā as the name of Ea in the third millennium, see the literature cited by Rubio 2006: 115–116.

137 The Hittite evidence for (a) god(s) ᴰ*a*-(*e*)-*ia*-, ᴰ*a*-(*a*)-*i*-*ú*-, most likely two different stems for the same deity, is collected at van Gessel 1998/1: 5–8. It all comes from Hurrian linguistic or religious contexts and all cases refer to Aya the wife of the sun-god (Hurrian Šimige). Ea,

However, W. G. Lambert has called attention to Ur III onomastic writings which can scarcely be interpreted other than as indications of a pronunciation /ea/:[138]

è-a[139]
na-ra-me-a / *na-ra-am-me-a* for Narām-Ea, "beloved of Ea"[140]
i-dì-ne-a for Iddin-Ea "Ea gave"[141]
du-šu-me-a for Duššum-Ea "Ea has been made luxuriant"

These Ur III "Sandhi"-writings are entirely in accord with a Babylonian development from /*ḥa*-/ to /e/.[142] This development has not occurred in the *a-ia*-writing of Ea-names at OB Mari and Alalakh VII.[143]

Ea names at Mari are usually written with É-*a*, this can sometimes alternate with a writing *a-ia-* even in the same personal name in the same letter.[144] However, the fact that West Semitic ḫaya- "lives" can also be written with *ḫa-ià/ia*, *a-ia-* and *'à-a-* (É-*a*) should warrant against drawing any too strict phonetic boundaries (*ḫa-ià-ma*-AN = *a-ia-ma*-AN = *ḫà-a-ma*-AN "El really lives").[145]

This need not imply that /ḥa/ had not yet become /e/ in Mari generally, which it clearly had.[146] It is perhaps not unusual that older or archaising pronunciations and writings of a divine name be retained beside newer ones: /'A(y)ya/ vs. /E(y)a/. This is especially to be expected in peripheral areas. It is also possible to envisage that these names have come under pressure from the West Semitic element *Ḥaya*, "lives", still active and productive in the Western region.

J.-M. Durand envisages a separate West Semitic deity *Aya* (of second millennium Mari among others) who shares many characteristics with the Meso-

---

by contrast, is spelled ᴰÉ-*a* in these texts, mainly lists of Hurrian deities. See for example Wegner 2002: 340. On Ea in Anatolia see Archi 1993.

138 Lambert 1984: 399. *na-ra-am-me-a* and *du-šu-me-a* added by Hilgert 2002: 68–69.

139 Hilgert 2002: 214 for Ur III attestations of È-*a*. The sign È was used to denote the sounds /yi/ and /ye/ already in Sargonic Akkadian, see Hasselbach 2005: 36, 118.

140 Hilgert 2002: 69 no. 29, 28, from Girsu/Lagaš and Umma respectively.

141 Hilgert 2002: 68 no. 11 (unknown provenance).

142 Hilgert concludes that it is very likely that these "Sandhi-writings", which apparently occur exclusively after nasal and liquid phonemes, reproduce sounds of everyday speech but is reluctant to draw conclusions on the basis of so few examples.

143 For the latter see above.

144 Durand 2008: 222; Charpin 1986: 352 fn. 2.

145 In addition to ARM 16/1 see Durand 2008: 223, with additional writings of *ḥaya-* "lives": e.g. *'à-a-a-bu-um* compared to *ḫa-*(*a*)*-ia-a-bu-um* at ARM 16/1 105.

146 In fact the development of *a* > *e* in the vicinity of /*ḥ*/ appears to have taken root earlier in the Diyala and Gasur, i.e. "peripheral", regions of the Old Akkadian period than it did in Southern Mesopotamia (Hasselbach 2005: 116, 118).

potamian Ea and may have originally been identical with him as *Ḥayyā*.[147] This would have been imported into Mesopotamia and become Ea, a completely different god, which there assumed characteristics of Enki. The above-mentioned supposition of a further god, *Ḫayyum*, made by Durand does not appear to be necessary, although it cannot be excluded. Rather I would suggest that we are dealing with a single West Semitic divinity *Ḥayyā*, that may have been partially and punctually identified with Ea under varying circumstances.[148] This *Ḥayyā* may also have been the origin of the alleged grain-goddess *ḫa-a-ia*(-)*am-ma* possibly attested in Middle Babylonian Hattic from Boğazköy.

At Ugarit in the late second millennium Hurrian texts in the local alphabetic script refer to Ea as *ey* in offering lists.[149] Furthermore, a three-columned vocabulary from Ugarit, with Sumero-Akkadian, Hurrian and cuneiform Ugaritic columns, and containing part of the god-list An, has the following equation:

⸢d⸣A.A = *e-ia-an* = *ku-šar-ru*, "Aya = Eyan = Kothar (lit. the skilled one)"[150]

The entry occurs directly after the entry for the sun-god, and is clearly occupying the position usually occupied by Aya, the spouse of Šamaš. It appears that Ea, written *Eyan* in the Hurrian column, has been transposed to this position in the list on the basis of the pronunciation of his name as *Aya*.[151] ᵈA.A-*aš* is also one writing of the god's name in the Hurrian influenced Hittite language epic of Kumarbi.[152] Although it is not transparent whether this particular writing is logographic, it is clear that the name of Ea was pronounced both as Eya and as Aya in the West of the mid to late second millennium. The conditions for this are generally unclear, but one might suppose that the degree and type of exposure to traditions emanating from Mesopotamia proper will have played a role.

This evidence can be complemented by the reading of the name Ea in first millennium Hieroglyphic Luwian inscriptions, which have, ironically, previously been used as evidence for a reading of Ea's name as Aya:[153]

147 Durand 2008: 222–225.

148 Charpin 1986: 352 fn. 2, argues for the unity of the writings *ḫa-ià*, *a-ia-*, É-*a* at Mari, without making it explicit whether he thinks these are all the same god.

149 RS 24.261, 14. Laroche 1968: 499.

150 RS 20.123 rev. iva 19; Nougayrol 1968: 248; Laroche 1968: 525.

151 Nougayrol 1968: 248 fn. 6.

152 KUB 33.106 ii 24, 30, 31, Güterbock 1952: 22. Otherwise it is written ᵈÉ-A-*aš*. The attestations of ᵈA-A, some of which belong to Ea and some to Aya spouse of Šamaš from a Mesopotamian perspective, are listed at van Gessel 1998: 1–3.

153 e.g. Kienast 1987: 37. Correctly Galter 1983: 4.

CEKKE (8th century BC) §24:
(DEUS) BONUS (DEUS) *i-sa-ha* "the Good God and Ea"[154]

TELL AḪMAR I (late 10th-early 9th century BC) §2:
"CAELUM"-*si-i-sa* || (DEUS) TONITRUS-*hu-sa* (DEUS) *i-ia-sa* | REX-*ti-i-sá* (DEUS.BONUS) *ku-ma+ra/i-ma-sa*$_5$ (DEUS)"HORDEUM"(-)*ma-ti-la/i/u-sa*
"Tarhu of the sky, Ea the king, Kumarma (the good god), Matila (the barley god)."[155]

MARAŞ I §5 (end of 9th century BC):
"SOLIUM"(-)x-*ma-ma-pa-wa/i* BONUS(-)*u-su-tara/i-ha* (DEUS) TONITRUS-*hu-ta-sá-ti-i* (DEUS)*i-ia-sa-ti-ha* LEPUS+*ra/i-ia-ti*
"and I benefited(?) the settlements(?) by Tarhunza's and Ea's authority"[156].

While the name Ea can be derived from the root **ḥyy* "life", this does not mean that it was identical with the word for grain, although this may have been derived from the same root.[157] If Ebla NI-*a-um* as seen above is in fact related to the word for "grain", then the writing of the divine name *'a-u*$_9$ as the correspondent of Enki, should indeed indicate that this is a completely different word, albeit perhaps formed from the same root (possibly **ḥayyāyum* or **ḥayāyum*).

Although this cannot be proved, it is a credible hypothesis that both ^{d}ḫa-ià and Ea were borrowed into Mesopotamia from this *Ḥayyā*, although possibly at different times or under different conditions.[158] They are palpably different gods in Mesopotamia. Furthermore, while the name Ea underwent the changes expected for a phonological shape /ḥayya/ in Akkadian, derived from the root **ḥyy*, the name Ḫaya clearly did not. There are four possibilities here:

(1) it is not derived from the same root **ḥyy*
(2) it is not related to the concept of "grain" at all

154 Hawkins 2000: 146. Here Ea is definitely not the grain-god, whose name is hidden by the logogram (DEUS) BONUS, to be read *Kumarma*. It is interesting that they are attested together in a couple however. Suggestive as these contexts are they should be fully explored in a paper investigating the nature of the god Ea.

155 Hawkins 2000: 240; for the Tell Aḫmar god lists see Hawkins 2006: 18.

156 Hawkins 2000: 263.

157 For derivation of /ḥayyā/ as *status determinatus* ("(he is) life (itself)"; "er ist das Leben" as opposed to /ḥayyum/ "(a) life" see Kienast 1987, with dissent on both typological and philological grounds from W.G. Lambert in fn.1. Espak 2006: 124 derives the name Ea from **ḥyy*, but via an association of "life" with running water, thus catering for Ea's association with springs and underground water.

158 See also Green 1975: 75; Espak 2006: 102.

(3) it is a logographic writing, ^{d}ḫa-ià,
(4) it is a loan-word into Akkadian, or otherwise falls under foreign influence.

Options (1) and (3) are essentially dispensed with by the data from Mari, which show a clear relationship between phonetic writings *ḫa*(*y*)*ya* meaning "lives" and the name of a god (?), Haya, Ḫayum.

With regard to option (2), J. M. Durand's explanation of **Ḫâyum at Mari as "the resuscitated god" appears to be an attempt to find another and separate explanation for this divinity within the framework of disappearing and rediscovered god myths, although this is not explicitly mentioned by him.[159] However, if this is the same divinity who has perhaps been borrowed into Hattic Anatolia, as ḫa-a-ia(-)am-ma the association with grain is clear. The evidence otherwise presented for ^{d}ḫa-ià as a grain god, is fairly meagre, and our sharpest argument remains essentially his liaison with Nissaba.

Option (4) assumes influence from a language where this change /*ḥa*/ > /*e*/ did not happen. Our attestations of ^{d}ḫa-ià go back too far (ED IIIa) to require us to posit anything West Semitic as the origin of the god's name as an explanation.[160] Rather at this stage we should consider direct influence from the Sumerian adaptation of the name preventing the development from /*ḥa*/ to /*e*/. The Sumerian god ^{d}ḫa-ià developed into a very different entity than the Western *Ḥayyā*, as did the Semitic god Ea in Mesopotamia. Admittedly, by the time we reach Ur III and people calling themselves *ḫa-um*-i.sa$_6$ it is no longer possible to say that these are not carriers of West Semitic names. In Mari we should consider that the pronunciation of the name of ^{d}ḫa-ià, if the same god can sensibly be said to be worshipped there, came under influence of West Semitic elements: *ḥaya* "lives" and *Ḥayyā* the god of "life", quite possibly a grain-god.

However, even if Ea and Ḫaya are not synchronically identical, we should at least point out the apparent parallels between their attested linguistic forms. Each is attested in a nominative in -u(m) as well as a more usual determinate or predicative state in -a:

	Ḫa(y)ya	Ea
AN:*anu ša amēli*	:: Mari and Ur III	:: Ebla and Ur III
[*ḫa-a*]-*u* : *ḫa-a-a*	:: *ḫa*-(*a-iu*)-*um* : *ḫa*-(*a*)-*ià*	:: ʾ*à-u*$_9$: *é-a*

159 Also not explicitly mentioned, but apparent from his notation, is that this god **Ḫâyum is to be derived from a different stem (type *parsum*, verbal adjective?) than the word for "grain" which he writes **eyûm*.

160 This is not to say that West Semitic influence at Fāra is impossible, cf. Krebernik 1998: 26s fn. 259, sceptically. At this point in the language's development there is simply no need to posit a non-East Semitic influence as the change /*ḥa*/ > /*e*/ has not yet taken place.

The fact that these few attestations span some 2,000 years must discourage us from making too much of this observation, however. Indeed, it is not an unusual parallelism for names attested in both West Semitic and Akkadian contexts, given that the former preserved the predicate state more fully than Akkadian preserved it after the 3rd millennium.[161]

To sum up using the maximal extent of available evidence we might present the following working hypotheses: All three words Ea (Aya), Ḫaya and *eû* can be derived from the same root **ḥyy*. Ea and *e*(*yy*)*û* represent in their initial syllables regular phonetic developments from Semitic **ḥyy* that would have been well under way by the Ur III period at the latest. They are not derived from the same word, however, as shown by apparent differences in the Ebla writings *'à-u*$_9$ = "enki" (*/ḥayyu/*) and NI-*a-um* = "grain" */*ḥayyāyum/* or */*ḥayāyum/*. It is thus not at present permissible to assume that Ea was originally a grain-god. While the only indications that there are appear to show that ᵈḫa-ià and Ea were separate as far back as they are attested in Mespotamia, it is nevertheless difficult to imagine that there was not some link at a very far remove, if both names are derived from the same root, and appear to display a similar inflectional pattern. This link may have something to do with a West Semitic god *Ḥayyā*, who may also have been borrowed into Hattic as a grain-goddess.[162]

Returning to the philological questions with which we started, a derivation of Akkadian *û*(*m*) "grain", "barley" from **ḥyy* is quite convincing, given the *a priori* association of ᵈḫa-ià, spouse of Nissaba, with grain, and the likelihood that this is a Sumerianised Semitic formation related to the same root. This "likelihood", however, is far from proven. It pre-supposes that the early Semitic forms **Ḥayyā*, **Ḥ/ḥayyum* also had an association with grain stemming from a larger metaphorical complex including word for grain **ḥayāyum* (?).

The question of whether ŠE is always a logogram does appear to be less easily dealt with in view of the foregoing discussion than one might have thought. Both words *še'um* and *e*(*yy*)*û* clearly existed in Akkadian. I remain to be completely convinced by M. P. Streck's argument that **ḥyy* would not have produced construct ŠE-e (<**ḥa*[*y*]*yāy*?). Indeed, the Hittite evidence of ŠE-*u-wa-an* may even suggest that *e*(*yy*)*û* was the regular word behind ŠE. There is, however, much that is still extremely unclear.

Addendum

After this article was sent to the editors, H. Erol, of Ankara University, alerted me to the following possible evidence for a phonetic writing of *še'um*. The

161 See also *Hadda/u* and *Adda/u* at Schwemer 2001: 58.

162 I assume that this divinity is identical with the Aya described by J.-M. Durand (loc. cit.).

Old Assyrian title GAL *ší-i-e* is interpreted by V. Donbaz as "chief of grain" ("Some Remarkable Contracts of 1-B Period of Kültepe Tablets I", in K. Emre, B. Hrouda, M. J. Mellink, N. Özgüc (ed.), *Anatolia and the Ancient Near East. Studies in Honor of T. Özgüc*, Ankara 1989, p. 78). J.G. Dercksen leaves the title untranslated, "chief of the *šius*" ("Some Elements of Old Anatolian Society in Kaniš" in *Assyria and Beyond*, *Studies Presented to Mogens Trolle Larsen*, Leiden 2004, pp. 171–172). It is indeed peculiar that /i/ should be used in a plene writing for /e/. The alternative possible reading *šé-i-e* introduces an unwanted glide. Also the fact that the non-logographic writing only occurs with this word, which is always written this way, should invite uncertainty. Attestations: Kt. n/k 31, 2; Kt. 89/k 376, 1; Kt 99/k 138, 1; Kt. n/k 32, 1. Data collected from H. Erol, *Eski Asurca metinlerde meslek adları ve unvanlarla geçen şahis isimleri*, MA Diss. (unpublished), Ankara University, 2007, p. 81. My sincere thanks are due to Mr. Erol for this information.

Bibliographical Abbreviations

AHw.	Akkadisches Handwörterbuch, vol. 1–3, by W. von Soden
CAD	Chicago Assyrian Dictionary
CHD	Chicago Hittite Dictionary
GAG	Grundriss der Akkadischen Grammatik, W. von Soden, 3rd edition, 1995
HALOT	Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament
MSL	Materials for the Sumerian Lexicon
MZL	Mesopotamisches Zeichenlexikon, by R. Borger
RlA	Reallexikon der Assyriologie

All further abbreviations can be found in the CAD and the CHD.

Bibliography

Agostino, F. di/Pomponio F. 2002: Umma Messenger Texts in the British Museum, Part One (UMTBM 1), NISABA 1, Messina.

Archi, A. 1993: The God Ea in Anatolia, in Aspects of Art and Iconography. Anatolia and its neighbours. Studies in honor of Nimet Özgüc, Ankara, 27–33.

Arnaud, A. 1985a: Recherches au pays d' Aštata, Emar VI.1, Textes sumériens et accadiens, Synthèse n° 18, Paris.

id. 1985b: Recherches au pays d' Aštata, Emar VI.2, Textes sumériens et accadiens, Synthèse n° 18, Paris.

id. 1987: Recherches au pays d' Aštata, Emar VI.4, Textes de la bibliothèque transcriptions et traductions, Synthèse n° 28, Paris.

Brisch, N.M. 2007: Tradition and the Poetics of Innovation, Sumerian Court Literature of the Larsa Dynasty (c. 2003-1763 BCE), AOAT 339, Münster.

Cavigneaux, A. 1980–1983: Lexikalische Listen, in RlA 6, 609–641.

id. 1989: Le nom akkadien du grain, in: NABU 1989, no. 52.

Charpin, D. 1986: Le clergé à Ur au siècle d' Hammurabi (XIXe–XVIIIe siècles av. J.-C.), Geneva-Droz.
Civil, M. 1982: Studies in Early Dynastic Lexicography I, in OA 21, 1–26.
id. 1983: Enlil and Ninlil: The Marriage of Sud, in JAOS 103, 43–66.
id. 1995: Ancient Mesopotamian Lexicography, in J.M. Sasson, ed. Civilizations of the Ancient Near East, New York, 2305–14.
Conti, G. 1990: Il syllabario della quarta fonte della lista lessicale bilingue eblaitica, Miscellanea Eblaitica 3, QS 17, Firenze.
Cohen, Y. 2004: 2004: Kidin-Gula - The Foreign Teacher at the Emar Scribal School. in RA 98, 81–100.
Dahl, J. 2007: The Ruling Family of Ur III Umma, a Prosopographical Analysis of an Elite Family in Southern Iraq 4000 Years Ago, Leiden.
Dalley, S. Forthcoming: Babylonian Tablets from the First Sealand Dynasty.
Deimel, A. 1923: Die Inschriften von Fara II, Schultexte aus Fara, WVDOG 43, Leipzig.
Durand, J.-M. 2008: La religion amorrite en Syrie à l'époque des archives de Mari, in Olmo Lete, G. del (ed.) Mythologie et Religion des Sémites Occidentaux, Vol. I, Ébla, Mari, 131–752, Leuven.
Edzard, D.O. 1972–1975: ^{d}Ḫa-a-a in RlA 4/1, 1.
Espak, P. 2006: Ancient Near Eastern Gods Enki and Ea: Diachronical Analysis of Texts and Images from the Earliest Sources to the Neo-Sumerian Period, Master's Thesis, Tartu.
Fairbairn, A./Omura, S. 2005: Archaeological Identification and Significance of ÉSAG (agricultural storage pits) at Kaman-Kalehöyük, Central Anatolia, in An. St. 55, 15–23.
Fronzaroli, P. 1989: Il culto degli Angubbu a Ebla, in P. Fronzaroli (ed.) Miscelleanea Eblaitica 2, QS 16, Firenze, 1–33.
George, A.R. 2007: The Civilizing of Ea-Enkidu: an unusual tablet of the Babylonian Gilgameš Epic, in RA 101, 59–80.
Galter, H.D. 1983: Der Gott Ea/Enki in der akkadischen Überlieferung, Eine Bestandsaufnahme des vorhandenen Materials, Dissertationen der Karl-Frans-Universität Graz 58, Graz.
Gessel, B.H.L van 1998: 1998: Onomasticon of the Hittite Pantheon 1–2, (HdO 1/33) Leiden-New York-Köln.
Gong, Y. 1995: Die mittelbabylonischen Namen der Keilschriftzeichen aus Hattuša und Emar, in: ZA 85, 47–57.
id. 2000: Die Namen der Keilschriftzeichen, AOAT 268, Münster.
Green, M.W. 1975: Eridu in Sumerian Literature, PhD Dissertation, Chicago.
Günbattı, C. 2008: An Eponym list (KEL G) from Kültepe, in AoF 35 (2008) 1, 103–132.
Güterbock, H.G. The Song of Ullikummi. Revised Text of the Hittite Version of a Hurrian Myth (Continued), in: JCS 6, 8–42.
Halayqa, K.H. 2008: A Comparative Lexicon of Ugaritic and Canaanite, AOAT 340, Münster
Hasselbach, R. 2005: Sargonic Akkadian, A Historical and Comparative Study of the Syllabic Texts, Wiesbaden.
Hawkins, J.D. 2000: Corpus of Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions, vol. I, The Inscriptions of the Iron Age, Berlin–New York.

id. 2006: The Inscription, in G. Bunnens, A New Luwian Stele and the Cult of the Storm-God at Til Barsip - Masuwari, Tell Ahmar II, Louvain–Paris-Dudley (MA), 11–31.
Hazenbos, J. 2003: The Organization of the Anatolian Local Cults during the Thirteenth Century B.C. An Appraisal of the Hittite Cult Inventories, (CM 21) Leiden - Boston.
Hilgert, M. 2002: Akkadisch in der Ur III-Zeit, IMGULA 5, Münster.
Hoffner, H.A. 1974: Alimenta Hethaeorum. Food Production in Hittite Asia Minor, (AOS 55) New Haven.
Hout, Th. van den 1989: Studien zum spätjunghethitischen Texte der Zeit Tudḫaliyas IV KBo IV 10 (CTH 106), Dissertation.
Jestin, R. 1955: Übungen im Edubba, in ZA NF 17 (Band 51) pp. 37–45.
Kammenhuber, A. 1969: Das Hattische, in HdO1/2 (Altkleinasiatische Sprachen), 428–546, 584–588.
ead. 1991: Die hethitische Getreidegottheit Ḫalki/Nisaba, in Bulletin of the Middle East Culture Centre in Japan 5, Wiesbaden, 143–160.
Kang, Shin T. 1973: Sumerian Economic Texts from the Umma Archive (SETUA), Sumerian and Akkadian Cuneiform Texts in the Collection of the World Heritage Museum of the University of Illinois vol. II, Illinois.
Karahashi, F. 2000: Sumerian Compound Verbs with Body-Part Terms, Dissertation, University of Chicago, Ann Arbor, Michigan.
Kienast, B. 1987: ^{d}É-a und der aramäische Status emphaticus, in L. Cagni (ed.) Ebla 1975–1985, Dieci anni di studi linguistici e filologici. Atti del Convegno Internazionale (Napoli, 9–11 ottobre 1985), Naples, 37–47.
Klinger, J. 1996: Untersuchungen zur Rekonstruktion der hattischen Kultschicht, (StBoT 37), Wiesbaden.
Kloeckhorst, A. 2008: Etymological Dictionary of the Hittite Inherited Lexicon, IEEDS, Brill, Leiden.
Krebernik, M. 1982: Zu Syllabar und Orthographie der lexikalischen Texte aus Ebla, Teil 1, in ZA 72, 178–236.
id. 1996: Neue Beschwörungen aus Ebla, in VO 10, 7–28.
id. 1996a: The Linguistic Classification of Eblaite: Methods, Problems and Results, in J.S. Cooper/G.M. Schwartz (eds), The Study of the Ancient Near East in the 21st Century: The William Foxwell Albright Centennial Conference, Winona Lake IN, 233–249.
id. 1998: Die Texte aus Fāra und Tell Abū Ṣalābīḫ, in Bauer/Englund/Krebernik (eds.) Mesopotamien, Späturuk-Zeit und Frühdynastische Zeit, OBO 160/1, Freiburg-Göttingen, 237–414.
Lambert, M. 1953: Épigraphie présargonique (V–VI), in RA 47, 84–86; 142–144.
Lambert, W.G. 1984: The Section AN, in L. Cagni (ed.), Il bilingualismo a Ebla, Naples, 393–401.
id. 1985: The pantheon of Mari, MARI 4, 525–539.
id. 1987–1990: Lugal-kisa'a in RlA 7, 146.
Laroche, E. 1968: Documents en Langue Hourrite provenant de Ras Shamra, in J. Nougayrol et al. Ugaritica V, Paris, 447–544.
Litke, R. 1998: A Reconstruction of the Assyro-Babylonian god-lists AN: ^{d}A-nu-um and AN: Anu šá amēli, New Haven.
Livingstone, A. 1997: The Akkadian Word for Barley: a Note from the Schoolroom, in JSS 42/1, 1–5.

Luukko, M. 2004: Grammatical Variation in Neo-Assyrian, SAAS 16, Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project, Helsinki.
Menzel, B. 1981: Assyrische Tempel vol. I/II Studia Pohl: Series Maior, Rome.
Molina, M./Such-Gutiérrez, M. 2005: Neo-Sumerian Administrative Texts in the British Museum, Di.Sc.A.M., Messina.
Nougayrol, J. 1968: Textes Suméro-Accadiens des archives et bibliothèques privées d'Ugarit, in J. Nougayrol et al. Ugaritica V, Paris, 1–446.
Olmo Lete, G. del/Sanmartín, J. 2003: A Dictionary of the Ugaritic Language in the Alphabetic Tradition, I-II, HdO 1/67, Leiden/Boston.
Pruzsinszky, R. 2003: Die Personennamen der Texte aus Emar, SCCNH 13, Bethesda.
Radner, K. 1998: The Prosopography of the Neo-Assyrian Empire, Vol. I, Part I: A edited by K. Radner, The Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project, Helsinki.
Richter, Th. 1999: Untersuchungen zu den Panthea Süd- und Mittelbabyloniens in altbabylonischer Zeit, AOAT 257, Münster.
Rubio, G. 2006: Eblaite, Akkadian and East Semitic, in G. Deutscher/N. Kouwenberg (eds) The Akkadian Language in its Semitic Context, Studies in the Akkadian of the Third and Second Millennium BC, Leiden, 110–139.
Sallaberger, W. 1993/1–2: Der kultische Kalender der Ur III-Zeit, Berlin.
Schwemer, D. 2001: Wettergottgestalten, Die Wettergottgestalten Mesopotamiens und NordSyriens im Zeitalter der Keilschriftkulturen, Wiesbaden.
Seminara, S. 1998: L' Accadico di Emar, Materiali per il Vocabulario Sumerico 6, Rome.
Soden, W. von/Röllig, W. 1991: Das Akkadische Syllabar, 4. durchgesehene und erweiterte Auflage, AnOr 42, Rome.
Soldt, W.H. van 1994: Letters in the British Museum: transliterated and translated by W.H. van Soldt, Altbabylonische Briefe in Umschrift und Übersetzung 13.2, Leiden.
Soysal, O. 2004: Hattischer Wortschatz in hethitischer Textüberlieferung, HdO 1/74, Leiden.
Starke, F. 1985: Die keilschrift-luwischen Texte in Umschrift, (StBoT 30), Wiesbaden.
Streck, M.P. 1997: Review of Soldt, W.H. van, Letters in the British Museum Prt 2 (AbB 13.2), in BiOr 54 no. 1/2 January - April 1997, 143–148.
id. 1998: Zum akkadischen Wort für Gerste, NABU 1998 no. 53.
Such-Gutíerrez, M. 2003: Beiträge sum Pantheon von Nippur im 3. Jahrtausend, Teil I, Rome.
Vanstiphout, H. 1989: The Akkadian Word for Grain and Laḫar and Ašnan ll. 189–190, NABU 1989 no. 58.
Weeden, M. 2007: Hittite Logograms, Studies in their Origin and Distribution, PhD Dissertation, School of Oriental and African studies, London.
Wegner, I. 2002: Hurritische Opferlisten aus hethitischen Festbeschreibungen, Teil II, Texte für teššub, Ḫebat und weitere Gottheiten, ChS I/3–2, Rome.
Wehr, H. 1971: A Dictionary of Modern Written Arabic, ed. by J. Milton Cowan, 3rd printing, Wiesbaden.
Zadok, R. 1977: On West Semites in Babylonia During the Chaldean and Achaemenian Periods. An Onomastic Study, Jerusalem.
Zeeb, F. 2001: Die Palastwirtschaft in Altsyrien nach den spätaltbabylonischen Getreidelieferlisten aus Alalaḫ (Schicht VII), AOAT 282, Münster.